



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/796,604	03/08/2004	Richard S. Bein	355492-2971	1765
88984	7590	03/25/2011		
FOLEY & LARDNER LLP 975 PAGE MILL ROAD Palo Alto, CA 94304			EXAMINER SAMALA, JAGADESHWAR RAO	
			ART UNIT 1618	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 03/25/2011	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

10/796,604

Applicant(s)

BEIN ET AL.

Examiner

JAGADISHWAR SAMALA

Art Unit

1618

—The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address —

THE REPLY FILED 22 February 2011 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because:
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.
NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.

6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7. ☐ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____.

Claim(s) objected to: _____.

Claim(s) rejected: _____.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.

12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____

13. ☐ Other: _____.

/Jake M. Vu/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1618

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues that the term "consisting essentially of" eliminates materials that significantly alter the composition. As to Porter and Patterson, the addition of a rheological modifier alters the composition to allow it to be more flowable. In the absence of the rheological modifier, the flowability concerns arising from a higher weight percent of contrast agent have yet to be met. This argument is not persuasive because "consisting essentially of" occupies a middle ground between closed claims and that are written in a consisting of format and fully open claims that are drafted in a comprising format". Further Porter and Patterson teaches that addition of rheological modifier imparts high viscosity to the composition under static conditions, yet permit the composition to flow freely under shear stress, a property which applicant is claimed (composition having high viscosity).

Applicant further argues that the composition of Dure-Smith are not direct intravascular microcatheter injection, as they would not be compatible with blood and could form insoluble droplets and are not relevant to the invention as claimed. This argument is not persuasive because this reference is combined for its teachings of knowledge in the art of contrast media composition containing tantalum metal from about 20% to about 70% by weight and that finely divided tantalum metal is completely inert and is not toxic to body tissue when incorporated in to composition in physiologically and pharmaceutically acceptable amounts.

Claims 25-29 rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-6 of US Pat. 5,667,767 and claims 1-8 and 16-23 of US Pat. 5,695,480 are maintained for reasons of record in the previous office action. The term "about" indicates a range centered on the recited values. In this case "about" indicates values both above and below 45%. Therefore, what values are included in the range of about 40% would include close to 45% as claimed.